

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1, 4-12, 15-17, and 20 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 9, 12, and 17 are independent. In the Final Office Action dated September 22, 2005, Claims 1, 4-12, 15-17, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1, 4-12, 15-17, and 20 remain in this application. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action dated September 22, 2005, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 4-7, 12, 15, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,684,969 ("*Ishida*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,513,342 ("*Leong*"). Furthermore, the Examiner rejected Claims 8-9, 11, 17, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ishida* in view of *Leong* further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,335,743 ("*Owings*"). Moreover, the Examiner rejected Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ishida* in view of *Leong* further in view of *Owings* further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,682,487 ("*Thomson*"). Claims 1, 9, 12, and 17 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, “the minimum size comprising a predetermined value established in the computer software application.” Amended Claims 9, 12, and 17 each includes a similar recitation.

In contrast, and as stated by the Examiner, *Ishida* at least does not teach or suggest determining whether the size of the graphical user interface is less than a minimum size for the graphical user interface and if the selected size of the graphical user interface is less than the minimum size, then altering the size of the graphical user interface to the minimum size. (See Office Action, page 3, lines 13-16.) Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that *Leong* does not overcome *Ishida*’s deficiencies. *Leong* merely discloses that a canvas window procedure runs a layout routine that causes each child window to calculate its minimum size. (See col. 5, lines 26-28.) A canvas window layout routine in *Leong* then employs the minimum sizes from the child windows to re-arrange the canvas window layout, change window sizes and distribute windows in accordance with pre-specified margin values, pad values, and other layout configuration parameters. (See col. 5, lines 33-38.) In *Leong*, a minimum size is calculated rather than comprising a predetermined value. Like *Ishida*, *Leong* at least does not teach or suggest a minimum size comprising a predetermined value established in the computer software application.

Moreover, *Owings* does not overcome *Ishida*’s and *Leong*’s deficiencies. *Owings* merely discloses a method and system for providing a window capable of being resized. (See col. 2, lines 17-18.) The window includes at least one control. (See col. 2, lines 18-19.) In one aspect, the method and system in *Owings* include allowing a developer

to place the at least one control in a desired position in the window and allowing a developer to set how the at least one control is to move upon resizing of the window. (See col. 2, lines 19-20.) Like *Ishida* and *Leong*, *Owings* at least does not teach or suggest a minimum size comprising a predetermined value established in the computer software application.

Combining *Ishida* with *Leong* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Ishida* and *Leong*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose or suggest “the minimum size comprising a predetermined value established in the computer software application”, as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claim 12 includes a similar recitation. In addition, combining *Ishida* with *Leong* and *Owings* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Ishida*, *Leong*, and *Owings*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose or suggest “the minimum size comprising a predetermined value established in the computer software application”, as recited by amended Claim 9. Amended Claim 17 includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 9, 12, and 17 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1, 9, 12, and 17.

Dependent Claims 4-8, 10-11, 15-16, and 20 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1, 9, 12, and 17, and by virtue of their dependency upon independent Claims 1, 9, 12, and 17. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 4-8, 10-11, 15-16, and 20.

II. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment After Final be entered by the Examiner, placing the claims in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed amendments of the claims do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Finally, Applicants respectfully submit that the entry of the Amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims, as amended, are patentable over the cited references. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Official Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Official Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Final


Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this amendment and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 23, 2006

By: _____


D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

Merchant & Gould
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-9946
Telephone: 404.954.5066



DKS:mdb